

REMARKS

Amendments to claims 1, 19, 30, and 40 are to incorporate the same limitation “second processor” from claim 27. Amendment to claim 27 is to explicitly claim the second processor, which was already recited in claim 27. Amendments to claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 38, and 41 are to bring these claims into conformity with the language of their respective base claim(s). Amendment to claim 22 is to correct a punctuation mark. No new matter has been added.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER § 103

Claims 1-22 and 27-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0042214 (Radatti) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0145228 (Suuronen). Claims 11, 12, 15, and 16 have been canceled, thereby rendering the claim rejections under § 103 with respect to these claims moot.

Claims 1 and 27 recite a device for managing network traffic flow that includes a first processor and a second processor, wherein the first processor is for receiving network traffic content, and the second processor is for determining whether the network traffic content contains the content desired to be detected. Claim 40 recites similar limitations. Claims 19 and 30 recite similar limitations regarding a device having first and second processors. Neither Radatti nor Suuronen discloses or suggests *two processors* that are parts of *a device*. Rather, Radatti discloses a protocol scanner and a proscribed code scanner that are software installed in a computer (paragraph 43), and therefore, does not disclose or suggest the above limitations. Suuronen also does not disclose or suggest the above limitations, nor does Surronen disclose or suggest implementing a device with two processors in the specific manner described in the claims, and therefore, fails to make up the deficiency present in Radatti. Since Radatti and Suuronen do not disclose or suggest the above limitations, they cannot be combined to form the resulting subject matter of claims 1, 19, 27, 30, and 40.

Also, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter are advantageous over known systems. In existing systems and methods for managing network traffic flow, the protocol processing and the content detection are performed by software that is processed by a processor. However, this suffers from the disadvantage that the processor may need to share

resources between the two tasks. By using a first processor to receive network traffic data, and a second processor to detect content desired to be detected, protocol processing and content detection may be performed in parallel or simultaneously. Also, this allows one of the processors to be specifically configured to process content detection so that this task can be accomplished efficiently. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter are non-obvious.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 19, 27, 30, and 40, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Radatti, Suuronen, and their combination.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-4047**, referencing billing number **7035332001**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-4047**, referencing billing number **7035332001**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 13, 2007

By: 
Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4960
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800